

GILBERT PALIOTTA, ) 3:11-cv-00121-ECR-WGC  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
vs. ) Order  
)  
STATE OF NEVADA, et al., )  
)  
Defendants. )  
)  
)

On January 5, 2012, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (#61) recommending that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#23) be granted, Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment (#30) be denied, and that Defendants' motions to strike (##34, 38) be denied. On January 17, 2012, Plaintiff filed objections (#62) to the Report and Recommendation (#61). On January 27, 2012, Defendants filed a response (#63) to the objections (#62).

The Magistrate Judge recommends granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#23) because he concluded that Plaintiff was not denied procedural due process for his disciplinary conviction, which was supported by "some evidence." See Wapole v. Hill, 472 U.S. 445, 454-55 (1984). The Magistrate Judge also found that there is no evidence that Plaintiff was not provided with proper procedural protections with respect to his disciplinary segregation sanction.

1 Plaintiff's objections (#62) do not address the bases for the  
2 Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (#61) directly, but  
3 rather reargue the same issues that were presented in Defendants'  
4 Motion for Summary Judgment (#23). Plaintiff's objections (#62) do  
5 not present any basis on which to reject the Report and  
6 Recommendation (#61).

7  
8 **IT IS, THEREFORE, HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and  
9 Recommendation (#61) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED**. Defendants' Motion  
10 for Summary Judgment (#23) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff's Cross-Motion for  
11 Summary Judgment (#30) is **DENIED**. Defendants' motions to strike  
12 (##34, 38) are **DENIED**.

13  
14 The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.

15  
16 DATED: February 17, 2012.

17   
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE